

Salve Regina University Digital Commons @ Salve Regina

Faculty Assembly Documents

Faculty and Staff

2-3-2006

AS Minutes 2006 02 03 Background

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac_assembly

Recommended Citation

"AS Minutes 2006 02 03 Background" (2006). *Faculty Assembly Documents*. Paper 117.
http://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac_assembly/117

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty and Staff at Digital Commons @ Salve Regina. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Assembly Documents by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Salve Regina. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@salve.edu.

Background: Assembly Meeting February 3, 2006

Motion

That the Faculty Assembly continue its annual evaluation of academic administrators,

with one additional step incorporated at the start of this annual process: that being to seek input from the President and each administrator being evaluated relative to items on the instrument that may need further clarification and those items they may wish to see added,

with the final decision to modify or add items being left with the Faculty Assembly, acting on the recommendation of the Assessment Committee.

Substitute Motion / Amendment by Substitution

The will of the Faculty Assembly is to hold in abeyance the annual administrative evaluations

and have faculty representatives work with President Antone to revise the evaluation form through dialog and collaboration between the Faculty Assembly and President Antone.

A vote of **YES**, means that the administrative evaluations will be held in abeyance this year and the faculty assembly will move forward in working with the President in revising the evaluation.

The Assembly's Bylaws

- “Normally, non-procedural motions presented for a vote must first be presented in writing to the Executive Committee Assembly, which may or may not place the motion on the agenda . . .”
Assembly's Constitution/Bylaws, A.8.a (p. 115, 2005 *Faculty Manual*)

The Executive Committee has the right to exclude proposed motions. Should it give the Assembly reasons for that exclusion?

- “A motion that is long, complicated, or especially significant should, whenever possible, be submitted to the Chair before the meeting.”
Assembly's Constitution/Bylaws, A.8.c (p. 116, 2005 *Faculty Manual*)

Should that also apply to a substitute motion/amendment that replaces a motion?

Amendments

In *Roberts' Rules*, under “Further Rules and Explanations” and “Improper Amendments,” the following is an example of an amendment that is against the rules:

2) one that merely makes the adoption of the amended question equivalent to a rejection of the original motion.

In other words, you can't propose an amendment that nullifies the original motion.

Was the amendment/substitution presented at the last Assembly meeting a hostile attempt to reject the proposed motion?

Precedent: the Amendment by Substitution / Substitute Motion

Reference was made to a previous Faculty Assembly meeting at which a “substitute motion / amendment by substitution” was presented. Here are excerpts from the minutes of that meeting:

December 3, 2001

This motion was presented:

“That the attached ‘Structure of the Salve Regina University Core Curriculum: A Program Designed for Lifelong Learning and Responsible World Citizenship’ (Prolog-Rationale, Goals and Objectives, list of courses, and Matrix) be the foundation on which this core is developed further.” The Motion originated in the joint faculty-administration **“Deliberative Committee on the Core Curriculum.”**

There was an extensive debate. Several faculty expressed their dissatisfaction. A motion was made to reconvene the meeting on December 17.

December 17, 2001

Here is an excerpt from the reconvened meeting:

- 6.4 **Substitute Motion / Amendment by Substitution.** A member of the Assembly proposed an Amendment by Substitution that was germane to the original Motion. It was seconded.

**[The Faculty Assembly recommends]
That the Goals and Objectives of the Core Curriculum: A Program Designed for Lifelong Learning and Responsible World Citizenship be accepted so that the Deliberative Committee on the Core Curriculum can continue with the**

**development of the Core Curriculum and
procedures for implementation in September
2003.**

The Speaker explained that this Substitute Motion / Amendment by Substitution, if the Assembly so decides, would replace the original Motion and its Amendment. During the debate on the Substitute Motion the original Motion may still be debated and amended. She [Johanne Luciani] also informed the Assembly that the President had agreed to a one-year extension of the preparation time for a new Core Curriculum, so that the new program could begin in the fall of 2003 . .

The Assembly voted 47 YES, 17 NO to replace the original Motion and its amendment (6.1 and 6.2) with the amended Substitute Motion (6.4 and 6.5).

[end of excerpt]

This should be kept in mind about that December 2001 meeting:

- During the “recess” between the two parts of the meeting, the members of the committee that had sponsored the original motion tried to respond to the concerns of the Assembly. The amendment by substitution was their attempt to provide wording that more clearly explained what the committee was requesting.
- The Speaker was informed well before the meeting and had time to evaluate the appropriateness of the proposed parliamentary procedure.
- The Speaker explained the parliamentary procedure to the Assembly.
- The original motion was debated at length and then the substitute was presented. After that, **both** could be debated.
- The substitute motion did not push the original proposal off the floor.